

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS**

**DIVISION OF ST. CROIX**

**EDGAR BERRIOS, RAYMOND ALLYNE,  
MALCOLM MACCOW, and VIRGINIE GEORGE,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**HOVIC; HOVENSA, LLC; JOHN PAULUS; DARYL  
KRAMER, TODD REIDLINGER, JACOBS  
INDUSTRIAL MAINTENANCE COMPANY, LLC;  
WYATT V.I., INC.; JACOBS CONSTRUCTORS,  
INC.; JACOBS ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC; and  
WYATT FIELD SERVICE COMPANY,  
Defendants.**

**2005-CV-0192**

**TO: Lee J. Rohn, Esq.  
Linda J. Blair, Esq.  
Stephanie L. Adler, Esq.  
Charles E. Engeman, Esq.**

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

THIS MATTER is before the Court upon Plaintiffs' Motion to Reconsider Order of August 7, 2008 (Docket No. 232). Defendant HOVENSA, L.L.C., filed an opposition to said motion, and Plaintiffs filed a reply thereto.

Pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7.3, parties may seek reconsideration of an order issued of the Court based upon "1. intervening change in controlling law; 2. availability of new evidence, or; 3. the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest

*Berrios v. HOVIC*

2005-CV-0192

Order Denying Plaintiffs' Motion to Reconsider

Page 2

injustice." LRCi 7.3. Nowhere in Plaintiffs' motion do Plaintiffs demonstrate that reconsideration is warranted upon any of those enumerated grounds. Plaintiffs refer to the order at issue as "unrealistic and unworkable," motion at 1, despite the fact that, as Defendants note, the deadline in dispute was the one requested by counsel for Plaintiffs. The motion is otherwise silent regarding any change in law, new evidence, or error. It appears that Plaintiffs merely are dissatisfied with the order and counsel's participation in the status conference during which the deadline was discussed. However, it is well established that "[d]issatisfaction with the Court's ruling is not a proper basis for reconsideration." *Central Reserve Life Ins. Co. v. Marelllo*, No. Civ. A. 00-3344, 2001 WL 41129 at \*2 (E.D. Pa. January 17, 2001) (citing *Burger King Corp. v. New England Hood and Duct Cleaning Co.*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1022 (E.D. Pa. Feb. 4, 2000)).

Accordingly, it is now hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' Motion to Reconsider Order of August 7, 2008 (Docket No. 232) is **DENIED**.

ENTER:

Dated: September 9, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
GEORGE W. CANNON, JR.  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE